

(approved August 19, 2004)

**BOARD OF BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES
LICENSING COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES**

May 20, 2004

**HYATT REGENCY ISLANDIA
1441 QUIVIRA ROAD
SAN DIEGO, CA**

MEMBERS PRESENT

Catherine Kay, Public Member, Committee Chair
Mark Burdick, LEP Member
Robert Gerst, Public Member
Jane Nathanson, MFT Member

MEMBERS ABSENT

Susan Ulevitch, LCSW Member

STAFF PRESENT

Sherry Mehl, Executive Officer
Denise Johnson, Assistant Executive Officer
Kristy Schieldge, Legal Counsel
Julie McAuliffe, Administrative Analyst
Meuy Saephan, Administrative Technician

GUEST LIST ON FILE

The meeting was called to order at approximately 9:40 a.m.

Ms. McAuliffe called the roll and a Committee was established.

1. APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 20, 2004 MINUTES

MARK BURDICK MOVED, JANE NATHANSON SECONDED AND THE COMMITTEE CONCURRED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 20, 2004.

2. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF 2004 STRATEGIC PLAN

The Committee reviewed their Strategic Plan. Ms. Mehl stated that all applications recently went through a complete legal review and applications were revised. The Licensed Educational Psychologist applications will be amended once any changes in law and regulation are complete.

Ms. Kay mentioned the objective of enhancing technology to streamline the evaluation process. Ms. Mehl stated that Board staff received a new applicant tracking system, which allows staff to extract additional information about candidates, supervisors, and settings for statistical purposes.

The Board briefly discussed the objective regarding clarifying definitions and setting standards for qualified trained supervisors. The Board has made several amendments to the laws and regulations in the past to further clarify responsibilities and training requirements. The last piece will be a regulation amendment to further clarify the supervisor requirement of direct clinical practice for two of the last five years. Additionally, the law was recently amended to take out specification of settings and enhance the experience. This change appears to have helped persons pursuing licensure.

Dr. Burdick asked Mary Riemersma, Executive Director of the California Association of Marriage and Family Therapists, if she had heard of any changes that had taken place since the law was amended. Ms. Riemersma stated that she had not noticed changes since the services provided in these settings continue to be the same. Ms. Mehl stated that more clarification may be needed in the future regarding payment for supervision from a supervisor outside of the setting.

Diana Simon, a professor at Loma Linda University, commented on Ms. Mehl's last comment. Ms. Simon stated that there is a lack of clarity regarding this issue and counties are not receptive to outside supervisors due to policies and confidential information restrictions. There is a tremendous liability issue regarding obtaining supervision from an individual who is not employed by the employer since the supervisor does not have access to information and communication regarding the cases, which will limit their supervisor's capabilities.

Ms. Simon suggested that the issue be brought for formal discussion and that supervisors be contacted to provide input on their difficulties in providing supervision as a supervisor who is contracted to a county.

Ms. Kay suggested that the Board provide some sort of support in making the contacts with the counties. She then indicated that the Board would not be the proper entity to address issues of confidentiality in county settings.

Ms. Riemersma clarified the written agreement sections of law that allow an Intern or Associate Clinical Social Worker to obtain supervision from a supervisor who is not employed by their employer. A written statement must contain an agreement between employers, supervisors, and supervisees and must contain specific language directly from law that allows supervisors to have access to records and the supervisee has to inform clients that they are under supervision.

Jan Lee Wong, Executive Director of the National Association of Social Workers, indicated that having a private practitioner being paid for supervision could potentially constitute a conflict of interest since they are paid by someone who treats their clients.

Ms. Kay asked for clarification on objective five, "evaluate the continuing education program", and asked how this may overlap into the Education Committee. Ms. Mehl explained that this aspect of the continuing education program relates to the courses required for renewal of a license.

Mr. Gerst asked Ms. Mehl to elaborate on the auditing process performed by the Board. Ms. Mehl stated that licensees are randomly selected for an audit and they are then required to submit the

documentation to verify completion of their continuing education. The majority of licensees are in compliance. Those that are not are given a short time to correct their deficiencies and if they do not complete the requirement, they are cited. Providers are audited in the same fashion and those that are not in compliance may have their provider status cancelled.

Ms. Gerst asked that a reminder to check the approved provider list be included on the website and in our next issue of the newsletter.

MARK BURDICK MOVED, JANE NATHANSON SECONDED, AND THE COMMITTEE CONCURRED TO ADOPT THE 2004 STRATEGIC PLAN.

3. REVIEW OF REQUIRED CONTINUING EDUCATION FOR MARRIAGE AND FAMILY THERAPISTS AND LICENSED CLINICAL SOCIAL WORKERS

Ms. Kay suggested that discussion be postponed to the next meeting due to the absence of the Board member who had requested this issue.

The Committee briefly reviewed the statutory requirements of 36 hours every 2 years. The only course that is required every renewal cycle is the Law and Ethics course. The other required courses are a one-time requirement.

Ms. Riemersma asked that a complete continuing education chart be added to the website as guidance to those who are completing their continuing education.

Ms. Kay asked that the comparison chart provided in a previous meeting as well as prior minutes reflecting prior discussion on the issue of the law and ethics requirement be included in the next meeting materials.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:03 a.m.